

11 December 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with Mr. Robert Johnson, Legal Counsel,
Passport Office, Department of State

25X1 1. At 1230 hours on 11 December 1964, in response to a request, [] met with Mr. Johnson at the Passport Office to discuss "a matter of great interest to Miss Knight."

2. The background of the situation was presented substantially as follows:

a. Congressman Michael Feighan proposes to introduce a bill which would authorize the issuance of passports with a validity of five years. Regular passports are now issued with a validity of three years subject to a renewal for two additional years. Miss Knight accepts and supports the Congressman's proposal.

b. However, when the draft bill was presented to the Department for comment, Mr. Abba Schwartz's office represented by his deputy, a Mr. Mace, rewrote the draft to provide that these five-year passports would be subject to renewal for an additional five-year period. Miss Knight is violently opposed to the renewal provision.

c. Mr. Johnson stated that the Passport Office was not consulted in the consideration of the proposed revisions of the bill and they were presented to Miss Knight as a "fait accompli" in a meeting with Mr. Mace on the morning of 11 December.

d. Among other reasons for disagreeing with the renewal proviso Mr. Johnson stressed, as being of particular interest to CIA, the position that such a practice would seriously weaken the internal security control which a passport represents.

He cited, for example, reduced effectiveness, for identification purposes, of a photograph ten years old. He pointed out that the number of valid passports throughout the world free from any effective Departmental control would be doubled. The problem of valid passports, lost, destroyed or stolen, now running about 8000 per year would be increased tremendously.

3. With the above as background, he went on to say that ^{at} the morning meeting at which Miss Knight presented counter arguments against the revision she was told, in response to a query, that the FBI and CIA had concurred in the proposed revision. Mr. Mace stated that he did not know who in the Bureau or the Agency had given the concurrences but that they had been gotten through INR. Mr. Johnson stated that efforts on his part had failed to disclose any person in the Bureau who had given any such concurrence and asked [redacted] to try to determine who, if anyone, in the Agency had been consulted.

25X1

4. Specifically, Miss Knight would like to know:

a. To whom in the Agency and especially in what form, was the request for comment addressed?

b. Can she be assured, in case an Agency witness should be called to testify at the hearings on the bill, that she will be afforded an opportunity to meet with the witness to present her reasons for opposing the proposed revisions to Congressman Feighan's bill?

[redacted] 25X1

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|--|--|--|-------------------|--|
| TOP | | | | BOTTOM | | | |
| UNCLASSIFIED | | CONFIDENTIAL | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SECRET | | | |
| CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP | | | | | | | |
| TO | NAME AND ADDRESS | | | DATE | | INITIALS | |
| 1 | Mr. John Warner, OGC | | | | | <i>[initials]</i> | |
| 2 | OIN | | | | | <i>[initials]</i> | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | |
| ACTION | | DIRECT REPLY | | PREPARE REPLY | | | |
| APPROVAL | | DISPATCH | | RECOMMENDATION | | | |
| COMMENT | | FILE | | RETURN | | | |
| CONCURRENCE | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION | | SIGNATURE | | | |
| Remarks: <div style="font-size: 2em; font-family: cursive;"> 1-2 See me, please <i>[signature]</i> </div> | | | | | | | |
| FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER | | | | | | | |
| FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO. | | | | | | DATE | |
| 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500240004-7 | | | | | | 19 Jan 65 | |
| UNCLASSIFIED | | CONFIDENTIAL | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SECRET | | | |